

REMARKS

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11 and 24 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,969,433 to Maggiora et al.

Claim 1 features a method of monitoring a vehicle trailer. In the method, a planned trailer uncoupling area is defined. It is then automatically determined that the trailer has been uncoupled outside the planned uncoupling area. When it is determined that the trailer has been uncoupled outside the planned uncoupling area the location of the trailer is determined with the global positioning system.

The Office Action indicated that claims 13-23 are allowable because the prior art of record does not mention a fully automated system. As amended, claim 1 requires automatically determining which trailer has been uncoupled outside the planned uncoupling area and is therefore not anticipated by Maggiora et al.

Applicant also respectfully points out that the system disclosed by Maggiora et al. is indifferent as to where the trailer has been uncoupled and therefore does not automatically determine that the trailer has been uncoupled outside the planned uncoupling area. The system disclosed in Maggiora will send a message about the uncoupling no matter where the trailer is uncoupled. For example, the system disclosed by Maggiora will send the same message even if the trailer is disconnected at the planned destination for the trailer. See column 5, lines 62-65. There is no hint that any special action would be performed in the system of Maggiora due to the location of the trailer or the vehicle. Claim 1 includes limitations that are not disclosed or suggested by Maggiora and is therefore allowable.

Claims 3, 5 and 7 depend from claim 1 and are also in condition for allowance.

Claim 9 features a method of monitoring a vehicle trailer uncoupling. As amended, claim 9 requires automatically determining that the trailer has been uncoupling outside a planned

uncoupling area. The Maggiora et al. patent does not disclose or suggest automatically determining that the trailer has been uncoupled outside the planned uncoupling area. As such, claim 9 is not anticipated by the Maggiora et al. patent and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 9 and are also in condition for allowance.

Claim 24 features a method of monitoring a vehicle trailer uncoupling. As amended, claim 24 requires automatically determining that the trailer has been uncoupled outside a planned uncoupling area. As noted above, this feature is not shown or suggested by the Maggiora et al. patent. As such, claim 24 is not anticipated by Maggiora et al. and is in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claim 4 as being obvious over Maggiora et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,917,433 to Keillor et al. Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and therefore requires automatically determining that the trailer has been uncoupled outside the planned uncoupling area. Neither Maggiora et al. nor Keillor et al. disclose or suggest automatically determining that the trailer has been uncoupled outside the planned uncoupling area. Claim 4 is in condition for allowance.

The Office Action rejected claim 6 as being obvious over Maggiora et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,625,335 to Kelly. Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and therefore also requires automatically determining that the trailer has been uncoupled outside the planned uncoupling area. Claim 6 is not obvious in view of Maggiora et al. in view of Kelly, since neither Maggiora et al. nor Kelly show or suggest automatically determining that the trailer has been uncoupled outside the planned uncoupling area.

The Office Action rejected claims 8 and 12 as being obvious in view of Maggiora et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,942,971 to Fauci et al.

Claim 8 depends from claim 1 and therefore also requires automatically determining that the trailer has been uncoupled outside the planned uncoupling area. Claim 8 is not obvious in

view of Maggiora et al. and Fauci et al., since neither Fauci et al. nor Maggiora et al. disclose or suggest automatically determining that the trailer has been uncoupled outside the planned uncoupling area. Claim 8 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 12 is directed to a method of monitoring a vehicle trailer uncoupling. In the method a planned trailer uncoupling area is defined. It is automatically determined that the trailer has been uncoupled outside the planned uncoupling area. Once it is determined that the trailer has been uncoupled outside the planned uncoupling area the trailer is automatically secured by deflating a tire of the trailer. Claim 12 is not obvious in view of Maggiora et al. and Fauci et al., because neither Maggiora et al. nor Fauci et al. disclose or suggest automatically determining that the trailer has been uncoupled outside the planned uncoupling area. Claim 12 is in condition for allowance.

The Office Action rejected claim 2 as being obvious over Maggiora et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,825,283 to Camhi. One of the limitations of claim 2 is automatically determining that the trailer has been uncoupled outside the planned uncoupling area. As is pointed out in the Office Action there is no mention in the prior art of record of a fully automated system. Claim 2 is not obvious in view of Maggiora et al. in view of Camhi.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-0630 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or 1.17; particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:



Kenneth J. Smith
Reg. No. 45,115

Telephone: (216) 241-6700
Facsimile: (216) 241-8151